

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 28, 2005, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by October 28, 2005.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Applicants' claim for foreign priority was acknowledged, but it was noted that the Applicants have not filed a certified copy of DE 10241515.3. The Certified Copy of the Priority Document was filed on August 4, 2005. Claims 1 and 9 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,955,805 to Chaudoreille et al.

In the present amendment, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to address the noted objections.

The Applicants will file the requested certified copy of the German document, as requested.

Turning now to the substantive rejection of the claims, the Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited patent to Chaudoreille makes obvious the subject matter of claims 1-14.

Chaudoreille et al disclose a cover element 20 (not a connection element) composed of a metal. The cover element 20 is used to close off the cavity 14 of the bearing 10 (see column 3, lines 14-21) and not to ensure a releasable connection of an electric motor (not alternator) with a machine or a machine part.

Element 34 of Chaudoreille is not a machine or machine part in the sense of the present invention. Element 34 carries diodes, therefore, it is an electronic device (see column 1, lines 46-54). In one intends to separate part 34 from part 10, this cannot be accomplished via part 20 since all parts 34, 20 and 10 are mounted together via bolts (see Chaudoreille, Fig. 2).

It is impossible to release part 43 from part 20 independent of part 20. In addition, part 34 is not driven by part 20, since part 20 is not a motor and part 34 is a fixed part that cannot be moved.

The cover plate 20 covers a first abutment (bearing side 10) and a second abutment (dissipater side 34). The first abutment is covered by a sealing gasket 22, which is a detachable part and not a thin, metallic coating. The sealing gasket 22 is used to ensure a sealant between the cover plate 20 and the bearing 10 because of the use of coolant liquid inside the cavity (column 1, lines 15-23) of the bearing. The coating, or hard coat, of the present invention, cannot be detached, since it is component of the connection element surface. The sealing gasket 22 of Chaudoreille cannot be compared with the coating of the present invention.

The coating of the present invention is applied in a fluid bath and also can be applied in the threaded openings to improve the heat thermal insulating further (see specification, page 8, paragraph 2). This makes clear that completely different subject matters are compared with one another in the Office Action. The second abutment of the cover plate 20 is covered by an electrical

insulator 32. Thermal conductivity is not a consideration for either the first or second abutment of the cover plate 20.

Indeed, Chaudoreille et al does not focus on the same object as the present invention. One object of the present invention is to avoid heat transfer from an electric motor to a machine driven by this motor, with the motor mounted on this machine. To avoid this type of heat transfer, the connection element between the motor and the machine must be constructed in a special manner so that it carries as little heat as possible from the motor to the machine. The sealing gasket 22 used often is made of copper. Copper is a very good thermal conductor. Therefore, the object of the present invention is exactly the contrary to the teachings of Chaudoreille, or in other words, Chaudoreille actually teaches away from the present invention.

Chaudoreille's object is to improve the cooling effect, that is, improve the heat transfer instead of blocking the heat transfer, of the components of the current regulating means (see column 1, lines 61-65). Chaudoreille presents a solution to optimize the heat transfer between part 34 and part 10 via the liquid coolant.

Since the Chaudoreille reference provides no teaching or suggestion that is related to spot welding systems or a spot welding process, the Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not consult the Chaudoreille reference when addressing the technical problem proposed in the present application. Even if the practitioner did consult Chaudoreille, he/she would not be provided with any information relating to a technical application that

investigates the quality of a weld point on a piece of material caused by a spot welding system.


Because Chaudoreille does not suggest the features of claims 1-14 of the present application, the rejection under Section 103 must be withdrawn. The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that since the prior art does not suggest the desirability of the claimed invention, such art cannot establish a prima facie case of obviousness as clearly set forth in MPEP section 2143.01.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 1, along with its dependent claims 2-14, are patentable over the cited references.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700